

REMARKS

Claims 1-5, 7-9 and 11-19 have been amended to more clearly define the invention. Claims 6, 10 were previously amended. Claim 20 is original.

The claims have been amended to more clearly recite that the claimed systems involve search, update and synchronization of object identifiers in a "plurality of different remote identifier code databases". Support for this and the other amendments is found in the existing claims and in the Application description on page 11-13 in connection with Figure 6 and in other places.

I. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)

Claims 1, 2, 5-10 and 12-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,055,516 – Johnson et al. These claims, as amended, are deemed to be patentable for the reasons given below.

Amended claim 1 recites a method for "determining identifier codes for an object associated with a plurality of identifier codes by a corresponding plurality of entities" by "receiving a first message including at least a first identifier code identifying an object, said first identifier code being associated with a first entity; extracting said first identifier code from said received first message; generating a plurality of messages incorporating said extracted first identifier code, said plurality of messages being for initiating a search of a plurality of different remote identifier code databases linking said first identifier code associated with said first entity to corresponding different identifier codes identifying said object, said different identifier codes being associated with entities different to said first entity; and receiving said different identifier codes corresponding to said first identifier code in response to communicating said plurality of messages for initiating searches of said plurality of different remote identifier code databases". These features are not shown (or suggested) in Johnson.

The method of amended claim 1 dynamically translates a code or identifier used by of a first entity (such as a first company) to identify an object such as a product, service or resource, to multiple corresponding codes or identifiers used by other entity (such as other companies) using multiple code mapping databases (Application page 2 lines 15-17). Specifically, the method involves "generating a plurality of messages incorporating" an "extracted first identifier code" for "initiating

a search of a plurality of different remote identifier code databases linking said first identifier code associated with said first entity to corresponding different identifier codes identifying said object” and “associated with entities different to said first entity”.

The system addresses the problems involved in effecting commercial transactions that arise through attempted integration of disparate computer systems where a retailer, one or more distributors and a manufacturer employ different identifier codes for the same part, for example (Application page 1 lines 15-30). The claimed system “alleviates the need to manually synchronize different identifier code mapping databases and files” (Application page 6 lines 17-19). Further, multiple identifier code mapping databases “are advantageously updated using received identifier codes”. Also “a distributed array of databases” is selectively used “for the transparent and seamless mapping of an identifier code associated with one entity (e.g., a requisitioning system) to a corresponding identifier code associated with a different entity (e.g., a materials management system) using Internet or other protocols”. In addition, the “databases used for this purpose may be dynamically changed by the addition or removal of databases from an access list” (Application page 13 lines 7-20).

Johnson does not show or suggest “generating a plurality of messages incorporating” an “extracted first identifier code” for “initiating a search of a plurality of different remote identifier code databases linking said first identifier code associated with said first entity to corresponding different identifier codes identifying said object” and “associated with entities different to said first entity”. The Johnson system illustrated in Figure 1A shows two databases (36 and 11) of suppliers/distributors catalog numbers. However, these are replicated databases or are alternative databases. This is clear from Johnson which states “When a customer asks for products by manufacturer part number or a competitor's catalog number, the CSR has access to cross-reference files, as earlier described, **either** maintained on the local host” (in database 36) “**or** maintained on the Distributor host computer 210” (in database 11) (Johnson column 17 lines 34-38). Consequently Johnson involves use of a single database (or either of two replicated databases). Johnson does NOT involve searching “a **plurality of different** remote identifier code **databases linking** said first identifier code associated with said first entity to corresponding different identifier codes identifying said object”.

In addition it would not be obvious to modify the system of Johnson to include multiple database searching since Johnson provides no problem recognition, reason or other motivation for incorporating such claimed features and provides no enabling disclosure of the communication mechanisms required to communicate with and synchronize part number information in “a plurality of different remote identifier code databases”. Consequently withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 under 35 USC 102(e) is respectfully requested.

Amended dependent claim 2 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 1. Claim 2 is also considered to be patentable because Johnson does not show (or suggest) “updating said plurality of databases to incorporate said different identifier codes identifying said object”. As previously explained, the Johnson system involves use of a single database and does NOT involve searching “a **plurality of different** remote identifier code **databases linking** said first identifier code associated with said first entity to corresponding different identifier codes identifying said object”. Consequently, the Johnson system has no need for “updating said plurality of databases to incorporate said different identifier codes identifying said object” and does not contemplate or suggest such a feature.

Amended dependent claim 4 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 1. Claim 4 is also considered to be patentable because Johnson does not show (or suggest) the feature combination of claim 1 involving “communicating said plurality of messages to applications useable for initiating a search of said plurality of different remote identifier code databases”.

Amended dependent claim 5 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 1. Claim 5 is also considered to be patentable because Johnson does not show (or suggest) the feature combination of claim 1 in which “a message of said plurality of messages initiates a prioritized search of a database and an object comprises at least one of, (i) an article of manufacture, (ii) a service and (iii) a non-manufactured item and an entity comprises at least one of, (a) an object retailer, (b) an object wholesaler, (c) an object distributor, (d) an object manufacturer, (e) an object servicing enterprise and (f) an object seller”.

Dependent claim 6 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claims 1 and 5. Claim 6 is also considered to be patentable because Johnson does not show (or suggest) the feature combination of claim 6 in which “said prioritized search of said database searches first for a purchaser product identifier

code identifying said object and subsequently for a manufacturer product identifier code identifying said object”.

Amended dependent claim 7 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 1. Claim 7 is also considered to be patentable because Johnson does not show (or suggest) the feature combination of claim 7 involving “extracting said first identifier code and a corresponding third identifier code identifying said object from said received first message, and said generating step generates a plurality of messages incorporating said extracted first and third identifier codes”.

Amended dependent claim 8 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 1. Claim 8 is also considered to be patentable because Johnson does not show (or suggest) the feature combination of claim 8 in which “said first identifier code comprises a purchaser product identifier code and said third identifier code comprises a manufacturer product identifier code and a message of said plurality of messages initiates a prioritized search of a database involving searching first for said purchaser product identifier code and subsequently for a manufacturer product identifier code”.

Amended dependent claim 9 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 1. Claim 9 is also considered to be patentable because Johnson does not show (or suggest) employing a “message” that “incorporates rules determining conduct of said search of said identifier code database”. Contrary to the Rejection statement on page 7, column 6 lines 20-30 of Johnson shows application of a rule implementing a search priority based on data fields contained within a message and does NOT show or suggest conveying “rules determining conduct of said search of said identifier code database”. In the Johnson system the search priority rule is within search program 50 of Figure 1A (Johnson column 6 lines 16-19) and it is NOT conveyed within a message.

Dependent claim 10 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claims 1 and 9. Claim 10 is also considered to be patentable because Johnson does not show (or suggest) the feature combination of claim 10 in which “said rules are predetermined in an application used for accessing said database”.

Dependent claim 12 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 1. Claim 12 is also considered to be patentable because Johnson does not show (or suggest) the feature combination in which an “identifier code

mapping application and one of said plurality of different remote identifier code databases are co-located on the same processor, said processor comprising one of (a) a server, (b) a PC (c) a wireless device, (d) a mainframe computer and (e) another networked processing device”.

Amended dependent claim 13 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 1 and because of the additional feature combination it includes.

Amended dependent claim 14 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 1. Claim 14 is also considered to be patentable because Johnson does not show (or suggest) the method of claim 14 in which a “said first message is received from an application initiating a transaction and including the step of, forwarding a composite message to a destination application in support of said transaction, said composite message being created including information derived from said first message and including one of said different identifier codes”.

Amended independent claim 15 is considered to be patentable for reasons given in connection with claim 1 and claim 9.

Amended independent claim 16 is considered to be patentable for reasons given in connection with claim 1. Claim 16 is also considered to be patentable because Johnson does not show (or suggest) receiving a first message including at least a first identifier code identifying an object, said first identifier code being associated with a first entity; extracting said first identifier code from said received first message; generating a plurality of messages incorporating said extracted first identifier code, said plurality of messages being for initiating searches of a corresponding plurality of remote identifier code databases mapping said first identifier code associated with said first entity to corresponding different identifier codes identifying said object, said different identifier codes being associated with entities different to said first entity; receiving said different identifier codes corresponding to said first identifier code in response to communicating said plurality of messages for initiating a search of said plurality of different remote identifier code databases; and updating said plurality of remote identifier code databases to incorporate corresponding received different identifier codes identifying said object”.

As previously explained in connection with claims 1 and 2, the Johnson system involves use of a single database and does NOT involve searching “a

plurality of different remote identifier code databases linking said first identifier code associated with said first entity to corresponding different identifier codes identifying said object". Consequently, the Johnson system has no need for **"updating said plurality of databases to incorporate said different identifier codes** identifying said object" and does not contemplate the feature combination of claim 16. The claim 16 arrangement advantageously enables "a managing application...to selectively initiate interrogation of multiple local or remote identifier code mapping databases. This enables a **"distributed array of databases"** to be employed, searched, updated and synchronized (Application page 13 lines 10-20). Neither these advantages nor the features of the claim 16 arrangement that provide these advantages are suggested in Johnson.

Amended independent claim 17 is considered to be patentable for reasons given in connection with claim 1.

Amended dependent claim 18 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 17. Claim 18 is also considered to be patentable because Johnson does not show (or suggest) the feature combination of claim 18 involving "generating a record of said search and provision of said different identifier codes for use in at least one of, (a) billing, and (b) creating a transaction record".

Amended independent claim 19 is considered to be patentable for reasons given in connection with claims 1, 2 and 16.

Amended dependent claim 20 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 19. Consequently withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 2, 4-10 and 12-20 under 35 USC 102(e) is respectfully requested.

III. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 3 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,055,516 – Johnson et al. in view of U.S. Patent 6,708,161 – Tenorio. These claims, as amended, are considered patentable for reasons given in connection with claim 1 and for the following reasons.

Dependent claim 3 recites "said plurality of messages use Simple Object Access Protocol (SOAP) for updating said plurality of databases". These features are not shown or suggested in Johnson in combination with Tenorio.


The system of claim 3 generates "a plurality of messages incorporating said extracted first identifier code" for "initiating a search of a plurality of different remote identifier code databases linking said first identifier code associated with said first entity to corresponding different identifier codes identifying said object" and uses "Simple Object Access Protocol (SOAP) for "updating said plurality of databases". Neither Johnson nor Tenorio, individually or together, suggest such features. Johnson as recognized in the Rejection on page 10 does not disclose use of the SOAP protocol. Tenorio discloses invoking communication between buyers and a global content directory (GCD) server using SOAP for the purpose of enabling a buyer access to the content directory (Tenorio column 10 lines 45-55). However, neither Tenorio (alone or with Johnson) suggest using SOAP for "updating" a "plurality of databases". The use of SOAP simplifies and facilitates synchronization and update of remote databases as recognized in the application. "The use of SOAP, XML and HTTP communication protocols in this manner to invoke a remote mapping database, advantageously enables an Application Service Provider (ASP) to remotely host identifier code mapping functions using Internet standards" (Application page 6 lines 13-16). Neither Johnson nor Tenorio recognize the advantages of using SOAP in updating and synchronizing databases and provide no other reason or motivation for incorporating the feature combination of claim 3. Further, incorporating the SOAP protocol as used in Tenorio into Johnson as suggested in the Rejection, results in a system providing a buyer with access to a server catalog of parts using SOAP but without any (SOAP based or other communication based) database identifier update mechanism.

Dependent claim 11 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 1 for the reasons given in connection with claims 1, 2 and 3. Consequently withdrawal of the rejection of claims 3 and 11 under USC 103(a) is respectfully requested. Consequently withdrawal of the rejection of claims 3 and 11 under USC 103(a) is respectfully requested.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that the Application is in condition for allowance, and favorable reconsideration is requested.

Date: 29 June 2004

Respectfully submitted,


Alexander J. Burke

Reg. No. 40,425


Ser. No. 09/973,349

PATENT
2001P07594US01

Alexander J. Burke
Intellectual Property Department
Siemens Corporation,
170 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, N.J. 08830
Tel. 732 321 3023
Fax 732 321 3030

Certificate of Mailing Under 37 C.F.R. 1.8

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231, on 29 June 2004.


Alexander J. Burke

29 June 2004
Date